



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DISCUSSION.

COLOR PERCEPTION OF CHILDREN.

The following brief notes may be made in reply to Miss Schallenger's strictures upon my Chapter on "Distance and Color Perception by Infants" (Chapter III of "Mental Development"):

(1) As to the allusions to Preyer's method, she will find reference to some notes sent me by Professor Preyer himself incorporated in the German (Reuther u. Reichard, Berlin), and French (Alcan, Paris) translations, which are both to appear about the time of this. I regret that the second English edition should have been reprinted without these and other revisions referred to below; but the publishers neglected to inform me that the chance had offered itself. In either of the foreign editions may also be found such changes of interpretation (very slight) as I now find it well to make.

(2) The mistakes (seven in number) which Miss Schallenger finds in my Tables I and II are all, except one, "read in" mistakes, *i. e.*, "read in" by the carrying out of decimals, a quite unnecessary proceeding in a matter where only differences of first and (sometimes) second place figures are of any value. The nearest approach to a mistake is the reading .90 for .882. I carried the decimals to the third place for the first three colors simply for fullness, not for any "discovery" thereby. The one real error (16 for 15) is a typographical mistake; it is correct in the first edition. It is also correct in the foreign editions.

(3) As to inconsistencies between the text and the tables, that is due to the fact which I mentioned in the preface to the second edition: an accidental substitution of columns; Miss Schallenger explains it correctly. In the second edition certain statements (only one of any moment) were noted for correction, and would have been corrected when the second edition was reprinted, if I had been given the chance.

(4) I shall look up the suggestions as to Lehmann, etc., and accept the corrections gratefully where I am wrong.

Miss Schallenberger's criticisms are, in the main, however, below the threshold of my intention ; seeing that I distinctly disclaimed much independent value for the figures given, the number of the experiments being too small. I published the results mainly for their illustrative value.

I have before advised experimental purists to " first catch " a live, warm baby, and attempt to work it ; my present critic shows that she does not know the difficulties of the task at first hand. While thanking her, therefore, for her minute examination of the chapter and promising to reconsider the points if I get the chance of a future edition, I yet fear that another revision would leave the matter still very unsatisfactory from a hypercritical point of view.

J. MARK BALDWIN.

Princeton, Aug. 13.

Professor Baldwin's notes are most encouraging. It is encouraging, in the first place, to read so frank an admission of error on the few points which have been singled out of my criticism for present comment. If the chance for future revision does come, I believe that Professor Baldwin will find such admission equally necessary on the more serious points of which he now says nothing. It is encouraging, in the second place, to find my general opinion of the value of the experimental work of this chapter confirmed by the author's own statements. If figures are printed not because they mean anything, but " simply for fullness " (!), it is time that criticism should begin. And if the fact that experiments are published " mainly for their illustrative value " can be seriously put forward as an excuse for great experimental inaccuracy, it is time for someone to point out that mere profession will not work in science any more than in conduct ; a man shall not be saved by the very best of intentions.

As to Professor Baldwin's concluding remarks, I really cannot see that the investigation of any baby, of whatever sort its ' vital differences ' and whatever grade its temperature, is furthered by inaccuracy of observation and record on the part of the investigating parent.

M. SCHALLENBERGER.

Stanford University.